	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/541,752	IKEDA, KEIKO
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	David J. Steadman	1656	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _Final rejection, response filed_

(1) _David J. Steadman_.

(3) _____.

(2) _Ryan B. Chirnomas_.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _23 June 2009_

Time: _AM_

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
   If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
NONE

Claims discussed:
NONE

Prior art documents discussed:
NONE

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
The examiner contacted Mr. Chirnomas for clarification with respect to the positioning of the "Target protein" and VP3 moiety shown in the representations at pp. 11-12 of the remarks filed on 4/13/09. The examiner noted that the positioning shown in the remarks is inconsistent with the claims, where the claims require the target protein to be located at the C-terminal end of the VP3 moiety, not at the N-terminal end as shown in the remarks. Mr. Chirnomas confirmed that the target protein was incorrectly shown as being attached to the N-terminus of the VP3 moiety and should have instead been shown as being attached to the C-terminal end of the VP3 moiety.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)